

11 SEP 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR: Mr. Richard Lehman
Deputy to the DCI for National Intelligence

SUBJECT : Competitive Analysis, NIE 11-3/8-76

1. This memorandum is for your use in informing the Director and Deputy Director of Central Intelligence and possibly other interested officials on the status of the experiment in competitive analysis being done in relation to this year's estimate of Soviet Strategic Programs and Policies. Summaries of issues and problems that may arise during the remainder of the exercise will be prepared weekly and forwarded to you each Monday.

2. As you know, the subjects selected for study -- Soviet ICBM accuracy, low altitude air defense, and strategic policy -- were taken from among the topics suggested by the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board. Similarly, the views of the Board's Estimates Evaluation Committee guided me in recruiting the team leaders and their associates who are working on the "B" teams. For various personal and professional reasons, some of those experts asked to participate could not do so, but I believe the composition of each of the teams -- provided in the attachments -- is sound, and the teams have met the approval of Mr. Galvin and his Committee. Funding support has been provided by the CIA Comptroller. The most severe constraint on the quality and depth of analysis that can be done by the "B" teams is, of course, time. Even substantial increments of funds and personnel would have done little to offset this factor.

3. Each of the three "B" teams are in full operation and have accepted the commitment to produce their initial drafts for exchange with "A" team drafts on 1 October. The review and preparation of comments on the "A" team drafts -- and such revision on their own drafts as they may wish -- will be completed during October to meet an anticipated date of transmittal of the final product to the NFIB sometime in November.

25X1

4. Because this is an unusual and tightly scheduled experiment it has called for a great deal of interagency cooperation, patience, and flexibility, both in providing substantive support to the "B" teams and in arranging and carrying out the administrative and security support arrangements required. On all counts I feel that the Agency and Community has responded with great dispatch and spirit -- in many cases to a degree that will deserve special mention when the exercise draws to a close. On the whole, support procedures now established are working well and should take care of most if not all future contingencies.

5. The situation on funding support seems to be equally well in order, although it is still not possible to be terribly precise as to total costs. Obligations made to date, plus my calculation of expected but not yet obligated funding needs are now quite close to the total amount authorized. To stay within this limit I have asked each team to stay tightly within specific control totals. I do not feel that this has seriously constrained them, nor do they apparently feel so. The greatest uncertainty flows from the difficulty of predicting the time and work required for the "A" and "B" team interaction on their drafts during October. I foresee a possibility that some overrun -- less than five percent of the total authorized -- may occur and I have received informal assurances that this support will be forthcoming from community components if that need arises.

6. On September 7, two of the team leaders -- Dr. Pipes and Dr. Lerch -- and I met with Mr. Galvin, Wheaton Byers and Cmdr. Olmer at Mr. Galvin's request. Mr. Galvin was briefed on the teams' activities and progress. He, in turn, wanted to assure the team leaders that they were not to feel obligated to force the evidence in support of specific conclusions just because they were asked to look at alternative hypotheses. Dr. Lerch, who is leading the effort on Soviet low altitude air defense, raised a question of net assessment with Mr. Galvin. He pointed out that unlike the two other topics, his subject required interactive analysis of Soviet forces and US penetration capabilities at several critical junctures. He said that the NIE also made net force judgments -- some of which he felt were not necessarily carefully considered net assessments -- and that his team would be looking into

some such areas in their work. He wanted to know if that would cause the PFIAB any problems, and he was assured by Mr. Galvin that it would not. At the close of the meeting Mr. Galvin expressed his and the Board's appreciation for the work being done and wished it success.

7. To sum up the status of this effort, I would say that I am generally satisfied with progress so far, though it would be premature to try to assess any substantive aspects of the work at this point. The "B" teams are working seriously at their tasks and there are no outstanding support problems at this time.



25X1

NIO Coordinator, Competitive Analysis

Attachments:
As stated

STUDY TOPIC: Soviet Strategic Policies and Objectives

Study being done in CIA facility by contract personnel, drawing also on military specialists of other US Departments.

TEAM LEADER: Dr. Richard Pipes

ASSOCIATES: Daniel O. Graham
William R. Van Cleave
John W. Vogt
Jasper Welch
Thomas Wolfe
Paul Wolfowitz

Other individuals to be consulted on an ad hoc basis

Joseph Braddock

[REDACTED]
Richard Foster
Charles Hertzfeld
George Keegan
Sherman Kent
Foy Kohler
Andrew Marshall
Thomas Moorer
Gordon Negus
Paul Nitze
James Wade
Seymour Weiss

25X1

STUDY TOPIC: Soviet ICBM Accuracy

Study being done [REDACTED]

25X1

25X1

TEAM LEADER: Dr. Roland Herbst

ASSOCIATES : John J. Brett
Kenneth Fertig
Gerald P. Frost
Robert L. Gould
Richard E. Hurst
Nicholas F. Kfoury
John E. Kirk
Raymond J. Manhart
William W. McFarland
Charles H. Stowe
David R. Vaughan
David J. Welch

STUDY TOPIC: Soviet Low Altitude Air Defense

Study being done [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

25X1

TEAM LEADER: Mr. Charles Lerch

ASSOCIATES: C. Tucker Battle
Theodore A. Bordeaux
John B. Cogdell
James Drake
Robert R. Fossum
Richard A. Greene
John W. Hindes, Jr.
John C. Nolen
Horace Ory
William A. Van Zeeland

Attached is a status report on the competitive analysis experiment prepared for Hank. It includes the list of participants that you requested. John is editing this down to a form suitable for distribution to NFIB principals as you requested yesterday. I will work this out with Walt Elder in the next few days.

Richard Lehman
Deputy to the DCI for National Intelligence

Date 15 September 1976

FORM 101 USE PREVIOUS
5-75 EDITIONS

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

FROM:

25X1 NIO Coordinator, Competitive Analysis

EXTENSION

NO.

DATE

14 September 1976

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. Mr. R. Lehman
D/DCI/NI

RL

Dick - If you have no objections I would like to send a few info copies of this to Cmdr. Olmer, Roger Molander, and to my support contacts at DIA and the services. I wrote it with that in mind.

The reference in paragraph 5 to funding support if I have a small overrun over the \$475K refers to an informal but firm pledge from DIA for \$10K and from [redacted] for \$10-15, if needed.

25X1